



Omohundro Institute of  
Early American History and Culture  
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

---

“Dangerous Designs”: The 1676 Barbados Act to Prohibit New England Indian Slave Importation

Author(s): Linford D. Fisher

Source: *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 1 (January 2014), pp. 99-124

Published by: [Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture](http://www.omohundro.org)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5309/willmaryquar.71.1.0099>

Accessed: 18/02/2014 23:27

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The William and Mary Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# “Dangerous Designs”: The 1676 Barbados Act to Prohibit New England Indian Slave Importation

Linford D. Fisher

ON June 14, 1676, the Assembly of Barbados passed into law an act that prohibited the importation of Indians to their island. The title of this act is well-known to historians of Barbados and the Atlantic Indian slave trade: “An Act of Explanation to the Act of Negroes, and to prohibite the bringing of Indians to this Island.”<sup>1</sup> Tantalizing snippets of its contents were recorded in the *Journal of the Assembly of Barbados*, which was sent to London, preserved in the Colonial Records Office, and later printed in the voluminous *Calendar of State Papers*: “Finding it needful to make some explanation of the late Acts concerning negroes, and to prevent the bringing of Indian slaves, as well as to send away those already brought to this Island, ‘being thought a people of too subtle, bloody, and dangerous nature and inclination to remain here,’ the Bill now read entitled an Act of Explanation to the Act of negroes and to prohibit the bringing of Indian slaves to this Island was passed.”<sup>2</sup> Scholars have understandably leaned

Linford D. Fisher is an assistant professor of history at Brown University. He thanks the following people for their insights and comments on prior drafts of this essay: Carolyn Arena, Adam S. Boss, Christine DeLucia, Alan Gally, Jill Lepore, Daniel Mandell, Neal Salisbury, David Silverman, Mark Valeri, and the anonymous readers for the *William and Mary Quarterly*. He is also grateful to the staff at the Barbados Department of Archives for their help, to Adam S. Boss and Hendrik Isom for their thorough research assistance, to Lynn Carlson for creating the map, and to Jo Fisher for copyediting. Research funding was graciously provided by the American Philosophical Society and Brown University.

<sup>1</sup> The title (only) of the act can be found in William Rawlin, *The Laws of Barbados, Collected in One Volume* (London, 1699), 122; *Acts of Assembly, Passed in the Island of Barbadoes, from 1648, to 1718* (London, 1732), 95; Richard Hall, *Acts, Passed in the Island of Barbados from 1643, to 1762, Inclusive* (London, 1764), 479. There is a minor discrepancy between the title of this law in those printed volumes and the title given preceding the full text of the act below. These printed volumes begin the title with “An Act for the Explanation”; the title preceding the full text begins with “An Act of Explanation.”

<sup>2</sup> “Journal of Assembly of Barbadoes,” June 13–14, 1676, no. 946, in W. Noel Sainsbury, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series: America and West Indies* (London, 1893), 9: 403. Like most of the *Calendar*, this excerpt is part summary of and part quotation from the original documents, in this case from the Assembly of Barbados

*William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 71, no. 1, January 2014  
DOI: 10.5309/willmaryquar.71.1.0099

hard on the particular wording of this summary, since it was all they had; the actual text of the act was thought to be lost. The date of the act (1676) seemed to indicate a connection with King Philip's War in New England, even though it was not explicitly referenced. The ambiguous wording of the act title and the *Calendar of State Papers* summary led some historians to conclude that this act marked a turning point for Barbados against Indian enslavement in general.<sup>3</sup>

The full text of the act itself, it turns out, has been preserved unnoticed in a huge volume of transcriptions at the Barbados Department of Archives, and it sheds important new light on the presence of enslaved New England Indians on Barbados as a result of King Philip's War as well as the particular circumstances on Barbados that influenced the drafting and passage of the act in the first place.<sup>4</sup> This law, as the full text reveals, explicitly

---

journal. The quotation within the excerpt comes not from the full text of the act itself but rather from the summary given on June 14, 1676, in the Journal of the Assembly of Barbados, Colonial Office (CO) 31/2, p. 223, National Archives of the United Kingdom (NA), Kew. Versions of this same excerpt from the *Calendar of State Papers* and the original Journal of the Assembly of Barbados have also been quoted in several secondary works, including Jerome S. Handler, "The Amerindian Slave Population of Barbados in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries," *Caribbean Studies* 8, no. 4 (January 1969): 38–64, esp. 57; Handler, "Slave Revolts and Conspiracies in Seventeenth-Century Barbados," *New West Indian Guide/Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 56, nos. 1–2 (1982): 5–42, esp. 18; Handler, "The Barbados Slave Conspiracies of 1675 and 1692," *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 36 (1982): 312–33, esp. 318; Elaine G. Breslaw, *Tituba, Reluctant Witch of Salem: Devilish Indians and Puritan Fantasies* (New York, 1996), 32; Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York, 1998), 168; Patricia Penn Hilden, *From a Red Zone: Critical Perspectives on Race, Politics, and Culture* (Trenton, N.J., 2006), 168.

<sup>3</sup> According to the archivists in the Barbados Department of Archives and my own previous investigation, the full text of this act was presumed to have been lost. Jerome S. Handler, a longtime historian of Barbados, came to the same conclusion. See Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 57. The book listing the acts of the Assembly of Barbados in the National Archives of the U.K. seems to be rather selective; it contains the full text of "A Supplementall Act to a Former Act Intituled an Act for the Better Ordering and Governing of Negroes" but does not mention this "Act of Explanation" or some other acts passed during these years. For the full text of "A Supplementall Act," see "Lists of Acts of Barbados," CO 30/2, pp. 114–25, NA. For an interpretation of this act as intending to end Indian enslavement in general on Barbados, see Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 57.

<sup>4</sup> The full text of "An Act of Explanation to the Act of Negroes, and to prohibit the bringing of Indians to this Island," passed on June 14, 1676, can be found in "Acts and Statutes of the Assembly, 1650–1682" ["Transcript Acts"], 421–23, Barbados Department of Archives, Black Rock, Saint Michael. Known as the "Transcript Acts," this manuscript volume contains later transcriptions of the original acts, including not only "An Act of Explanation" but also "A Supplementall Act to a Former Act Intituled an Act for the Better Ordering and Governing of Negroes," which can be found in *ibid.*, 410–20. Some of the originals are presumed not to be extant. I am grateful to the archivists at the Barbados Department of Archives for locating this elusive volume for me. A transcript of the "Act of Explanation" appears on 122–24.

targeted Indians from New England, and Barbadians made far more extensive attempts to completely rid the island of New England Natives than historians have previously realized. But the act was not intended to root out or prohibit Indian slavery more generally on Barbados. Equally important is the fact that it was paired with an act concerning enslaved Africans, as the full title of the legislation makes clear. Read in conjunction with that act concerning enslaved Africans and with a few other important acts passed in the 1670s, along with other entries in the Journal of the Assembly of Barbados from this period, the full text of this 1676 act helps fill in some of the missing pieces regarding the destination of enslaved New England Indians during King Philip's War, enables a better understanding of the intertwined and yet distinct nature of Indian and African enslavement in the Atlantic world, and gives greater clarity regarding Barbadian views of Indian slaves more generally and of enslaved New England Indians in particular.

Indian enslavement in the Americas is as old as colonization itself, even if it has received relatively little attention from scholars until recently. Over the course of the past decade or so, historians have reopened the topic of Indian enslavement in the Atlantic world as a serious subject of academic inquiry.<sup>5</sup> This scholarship has argued that Indian enslavement happened on a surprisingly large scale in English, French, and Spanish North American colonies, was intimately interwoven with the colonial process, and involved far more Native middlemen than previously understood. Scholars continue to broaden the geographic scope of studies on Indian enslavement, with the central section of the continent receiving sustained academic treatment. Several recent collections of essays reveal the full spectrum of the emerging scholarship on the topic, with articles focusing on Virginia, South Carolina, New England, the Spanish Southwest, and New France.<sup>6</sup> This

<sup>5</sup> Early books, such as Almon Wheeler Lauber's *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times within the Present Limits of the United States* (New York, 1913), pioneered this field, but it took historians a remarkably long time to expand on Lauber's broad-ranging, even if not always exhaustive, work. Other essays and dissertations were written on this topic from the 1910s to the 1990s, but for the most part they were regional studies and did not enter mainstream academic literature. See for example Sanford Winston, "Indian Slavery in the Carolina Region," *Journal of Negro History* 19, no. 4 (October 1934): 431–40; L. R. Bailey, *Indian Slave Trade in the Southwest* (Los Angeles, 1966); John Donald Duncan, "Servitude and Slavery in Colonial South Carolina, 1670–1776" (Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 1971); William Robert Snell, "Indian Slavery in Colonial South Carolina, 1671–1795" (Ph.D. diss., University of Alabama, 1972).

<sup>6</sup> Early works that led the resurgence in scholarship on Indian slavery include James F. Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2002); Alan Galloway, *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670–1717* (New Haven, Conn., 2002). On Indians as slavers, in addition to Galloway, *Indian Slave Trade*, see Eric E. Bowne, *The Westo Indians: Slave Traders of the Early Colonial South* (Tuscaloosa, Ala., 2005). For the geographic spread of studies on Native enslavement, see Kathleen DuVal, *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent* (Philadelphia, 2006); Carl

recent literature notwithstanding, historians of North America have struggled to incorporate the story of Indian enslavement into the larger reality of forced Indian movement and migration around the wider Atlantic world.<sup>7</sup> New studies of Indian enslavement in the Caribbean are under way, and rightfully so, as there is still much that historians do not know, particularly about the specific origins of American Indians who appear in the records of various European colonies, largely without any indication of their place or tribe of origin. One of the more vexing questions in the literature on Indian enslavement in the English Caribbean is the fate of New England Natives who were enslaved during the seventeenth-century wars. The existing literature ranges widely from the academic to the speculative or oral-historical.<sup>8</sup> This 1676 Barbados New England Indian slave law, then, affords an excellent window on the particular context of Indian enslavement in Barbados in the 1670s, the fate of at least a number of enslaved New England Indians, and the ways in which Indian enslavement was linked with larger trends and patterns in the broader English Atlantic world.

INDIAN ENSLAVEMENT ON BARBADOS dates back to its founding in 1627, when Captain Henry Powell transported thirty-two Indians to the island

---

J. Ekberg, *Stealing Indian Women: Native Slavery in the Illinois Country* (Urbana, Ill., 2007); Gallay, ed., *Indian Slavery in Colonial America* (Lincoln, Neb., 2009); Stephanie Pratt and Max Carocci, eds., *Native American Adoption, Captivity, and Slavery in Changing Contexts* (New York, 2012); Christina Snyder, *Slavery in Indian Country: The Changing Face of Captivity in Early America* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012).

<sup>7</sup> For a good discussion of this problem more generally, see Paul Cohen, "Was There an Amerindian Atlantic? Reflections on the Limits of a Historiographical Concept," *History of European Ideas* 34, no. 4 (December 2008): 388–410. The one obvious recent exception in the scholarship on the French colonies is Brett Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slavery in New France* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2012). For the English Atlantic, Jerome S. Handler has been writing on Native Americans in Barbados since the late 1960s, and scholars of North America have often leaned on his analyses—if, in fact, they reference Indians on Barbados at all. Nonetheless, Handler's concerns are more anthropological and localized in nature, often with reference to the regional Caribbean and northern South America. See for example Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 38–64; Handler, "Aspects of Amerindian Ethnography in 17th Century Barbados," *Caribbean Studies* 9, no. 4 (January 1970): 50–72. On the Spanish Atlantic, see Nancy E. van Deusen, "Seeing *Indios* in Sixteenth-Century Castile," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 69, no. 2 (April 2012): 205–34.

<sup>8</sup> See for example Jean Foggo Simon, "St. David's Indian Committee," <http://www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~bmuwgv/stdavidislanders.htm>, accessed May 22, 2012; Ethel Boissevain, "Whatever Became of the New England Indians Shipped to Bermuda to Be Sold as Slaves?" *Man in the Northeast*, no. 21 (Spring 1981): 103–14; Patricia Penn Hilden, "Hunting North American Indians in Barbados," May 2002, University of California, Santa Barbara, Center for Black Studies Research, <http://www.research.ucsb.edu/cbs/xsite/lectures/legacy/Hilden.html>; Max Carocci, "Written Out of History: Contemporary Native American Narratives of Enslavement," *Anthropology Today* 25, no. 3 (June 2009): 18–22; Christine DeLucia, "The Memory Frontier: Uncommon Pursuits of Past and Place in the Northeast after King Philip's War," *Journal of American History* 98, no. 4 (March 2012): 975–97.

from the Dutch colony of Guiana on the South American coast. These Natives had agreed to teach the English how to grow cotton, tobacco, and indigo and to facilitate trade between Barbados and the mainland colonies, all under the promise of living “as free people.” Such freedom was short-lived, for sometime after Powell’s departure, other Barbadian planters took the Indians “by force and made them slaves.”<sup>9</sup> Population estimates from 1627 clearly lump together the ten initially imported Africans on Barbados with the thirty or so Indians, for a total of between forty and fifty “slaues of Indynes and blacks.”<sup>10</sup> The English felt particularly fortunate that Barbados (like Bermuda) did not have a Native population at the time of settlement; the combination of early Spanish slave raiding and attacks by Carib Indians had largely removed the original Arawak Indian inhabitants by the early seventeenth century. Other Caribbean islands, such as Antigua, Dominica, Saint Lucia, and Saint Vincent, were still home to some of these Caribs, and the English chose to expend considerable money, resources, and energy to protect themselves and conquer these Native populations over the course of the seventeenth century.<sup>11</sup> This was not the case on Barbados, where the island’s relative isolation in the Lesser Antilles and the prior decimation of the original indigenous population allowed settlement to proceed unhindered (Figure I).

As one of the earliest of the English Caribbean colonies, Barbados quickly developed strong connections with England and English North America, through both trade and family ties. Although it took a few decades of experimentation to identify sugar as a stable and successful export crop, by the 1660s Barbados was the most lucrative colony in the English Atlantic. Since sugar plantations required enormous amounts of

<sup>9</sup> N. Darnell Davis, ed., “Papers Relating to the Early History of Barbados,” *Timehri*, new ser., 5 (1891): 51–60 (“as free people,” 54, “by force,” 55); Davis, “Papers Relating to the Early History of Barbados and St. Kitts,” *Timehri* 6 (1892): 327–49, esp. 328n. Jerome S. Handler identifies these Indians as Arawaks. See Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 38–39. Henry Powell was petitioning for the freedom of five specific Indians still enslaved on Barbados approximately twenty years later: Yon, her three children, and an Indian boy named Barbados, serving under Colonel Ellises. See Powell’s petition in Davis, *Timehri* 5: 54–55. See also Richard S. Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624–1713* (1972; repr., Chapel Hill, N.C., 2000), 71, 227. For an analysis of the timing of the Arawaks’ enslavement on Barbados, see Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 40–47.

<sup>10</sup> Henry Winthrop to Emmanuel Downing (?), Aug. 22, 1627, in *Winthrop Papers* (Boston, 1929), 1: 357 (quotation). See also Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 227.

<sup>11</sup> For information regarding Barbados at the time of English settlement, see Testimony of Nicholas Broune, in Davis, *Timehri* 6: 330. See also Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 39–40. Governor Jonathan Atkins summarized early violent encounters with Natives on St. Lucia, Antigua, and St. Vincent in 1676. See “An account of His Majesty’s Island of Barbadoes and the Government thereof,” Feb. 3, 1676, CO 29/2, pp. 13–14, NA. See also Philip P. Boucher, *Cannibal Encounters: Europeans and Island Caribs, 1492–1763* (Baltimore, 1992), chap. 3; Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 74.



FIGURE I

Barbados, ca. 1670. Map by Lynn Carlson, GISP, Brown University.

labor, Barbados was also one of the first English colonies to import enslaved Africans in substantial numbers, especially after 1640. By the mid-1670s, Barbados governor Jonathan Atkins reported that there were 21,725 white men, women, and children and 32,473 Africans on the island.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Henry Winthrop, the son of John Winthrop (soon to be governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company), was an early settler in Barbados, and from the opening years of New England settlement, Barbados proved to be an important trading partner. See Henry Winthrop to John Winthrop, Oct. 15, 1627, in *Winthrop Papers*, 1: 361–62. On the relative wealth of Barbadian planters, see Richard S. Dunn, “The Barbados Census of 1680: Profile of the Richest Colony in English America,” *WMQ* 26, no. 1 (January 1969): 3–30; Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 76, 83. See also Carla Gardina Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640–1661* (Cambridge, Mass., 2007), 37. Dunn suggests that although Barbados planters purchased African slaves from Dutch



English policies regarding Indian enslavement were confused and varied. At the broadest official level, there was a general presumption against the enslavement of free peoples that was in keeping with royal views of the rights of Natives more generally.<sup>13</sup> Most English magistrates differentiated between justly and unjustly enslaved Indians—from the English perspective, at least. English officials almost universally accepted enslaving Indians in what they believed were just wars, along with purchasing Indians who had been enslaved by other imperial powers (presumably also justly, although they seemed to care less about this distinction once Indians were already in bondage).<sup>14</sup> In Massachusetts, Indian enslavement (except through warfare) was at least theoretically outlawed in 1641, as was “man-stealing” in 1647.<sup>15</sup> The same was generally true in the Caribbean. In July 1667 Governor William Willoughby of Barbados sent two New England Natives to the magistrates of Massachusetts. Willoughby explained that these Natives had been sent to England, taken to Barbados, and sold as slaves. Willoughby somehow caught wind of these events and returned

---

traders in the 1640s and 1650s, by the 1660s Barbadians had turned almost exclusively to English traders. After 1672 the Royal African Company provided the vast majority of enslaved Africans, although discontentment with prices and lack of adequate supply led to complaints over time. These enslaved Africans, even early on, seem mostly to have come directly from the west coast of Africa. See Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 230–31. Governor Jonathan Atkins suggested to the Lords of Trade and Plantations that one way to get rid of “refractorie dangerous and bad Negroes” was to sell them to Spanish merchants, who would turn around and sell them at Havana. See Atkins to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, May 13, 1677, CO 1/40, p. 80, NA. Regarding the demographic breakdown of Barbados, see Atkins to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, Feb. 3, 1676, CO 29/2, p. 55, NA. Scholars cite various population ratios; Virginia Bernhard states that by the 1670s there were 44,000 Africans on the island and 21,000 whites. See Bernhard, *Slaves and Slaveholders in Bermuda, 1616–1782* (Columbia, Mo., 1999), 66.

<sup>13</sup> Margaret Ellen Newell and Alan Gallay have suggested that, unlike with the French and Spanish, there was no wider and sustained public discussion among the English about the legalities of Indian enslavement and Indian slavery. A relative lack of centralization within the English Empire also contributed to the regional differences. Newell, “Indian Slavery in Colonial New England,” in Gallay, *Indian Slavery in Colonial America*, 33–66, esp. 37; Gallay, *Indian Slave Trade*, 66. Gallay has argued that “the enslavement of free people was considered morally reprehensible” to the English (Gallay, *Indian Slave Trade*, 65). Broader royal policies regarding Native Americans (and how they were at odds with local, colonial practices at times) are reflected, to take just one example in the context of Native land rights, in a letter from the Lords of Trade and Plantations in which they reminded the Massachusetts Bay magistrates that the phrase “children of men” in Psalm 115:16 “comprehends Indians as well as English.” Richard Nicolls et al. to the Massachusetts General Court, May 24, 1665, in Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England* (Boston, 1854), vol. 4, pt. 2, 213.

<sup>14</sup> Brett Rushforth’s discussion of European policies regarding Indian slaves versus Indian enslavement is helpful here. See Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance*, 89–95.

<sup>15</sup> Newell, “Indian Slavery in Colonial New England,” 38. See also Lepore, *Name of War*, 166.



them to New England, profusely apologizing and promising to “rectify all such abuses.”<sup>16</sup> A few months before enslaved New England Indians began arriving in larger numbers on Barbados, Governor Atkins received orders from King Charles II in June 1675 that the Carib Indians who “had been brought away against their will” should be returned “to their native country.”<sup>17</sup> Similarly, an English merchant named James Davis was put on trial in Jamaica during late 1675 for a number of infractions, one of which was “that hee brought away with him three free Indians, contrary to the orders of his Ma[jes]ty,” apparently from Surinam.<sup>18</sup>

Nonetheless, local and individual practices varied considerably. Early European explorers—English ones included—had few qualms about blatantly kidnapping Natives either to be flaunted as trophies in Europe or to be sold as slaves. In English colonies Natives could legally be enslaved through warfare, as a punishment for committing certain crimes, or for indebtedness.<sup>19</sup> Enslavement as punishment was not uncommon in seventeenth-century New England, and Barbados was one of the most logical destinations for such malefactors, given the vibrant trade connections between the English mainland colonies and the island and the latter’s constant demand for labor. In 1660 the colony of Connecticut—with the approval of the United Colonies—ordered that local officials be sent to apprehend four Narragansetts for “an act of insolence” against some colonists. The Connecticut General Court ordered that, should the mission be successful, the four Indians were to be “sent to Barbadoes and sold as slaves.”<sup>20</sup> Similarly, in 1674 an Indian on Cape Cod named Hoken broke into the house of James Bursell of Yarmouth (thereby adding to a long list of prior offenses), for which he was captured and thrown into prison. When Hoken escaped from jail, stole a horse, threatened several people, and in general disturbed the public peace, Plymouth officials ordered him “sold or sent to Barbadoes, for to satisfy his debts and to free the collonie from soe ill a member.”<sup>21</sup> Hoken’s subsequent sale for only eight pounds

<sup>16</sup> Joseph B. Felt, *The Ecclesiastical History of New England: Comprising Not Only Religious, but Also Moral, and Other Relations* (Boston, 1862), 2: 418 (quotation). For a broader background on Indian enslavement in New England, see Newell, “Indian Slavery in Colonial New England.”

<sup>17</sup> Sec. Coventry to Sir Jonathan Atkins, June 23, 1675, no. 601, in Sainsbury, *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, 9: 248.

<sup>18</sup> Governor Lord Vaughan to Sec. Sir Joseph Williamson, Dec. 8, 1675, CO 1/35, nos. 561 (quotation), 56.

<sup>19</sup> Newell, “Indian Slavery in Colonial New England,” esp. 35–36; Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and “Race” in New England, 1780–1860* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1998).

<sup>20</sup> Samuel Orcutt and Ambrose Beardsley, *The History of the Old Town of Derby, Connecticut, 1642–1880: With Biographies and Genealogies* (Springfield, Mass., 1880), lviii (quotations).

<sup>21</sup> Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., *Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England* (1856; repr., New York, 1968), 5: 151–52 (quotation, 5: 152).

may not have paid off his debts, but it did successfully transfer a perceived troublemaker and social nuisance from one colony to another.<sup>22</sup>

From the 1620s to the 1680s, hundreds of Indians were forcibly taken to Barbados from varying locales in the Atlantic world.<sup>23</sup> As Richard Ligon reported in 1657, these Indians were “fetcht” from neighboring islands and the South American mainland and made “slaves.”<sup>24</sup> It is clear that this importation of and reliance on Indian labor represented a small fraction compared to the African population by midcentury, even though as early as 1636 Africans and Indians were both presumed to be sold into slavery for life on Barbados unless otherwise specified. A few Natives from North America were likely present, although in small numbers indeed. Even before King Philip’s War, a small trickle of enslaved New England Natives had been sent or taken to Barbados. John Manniford, a trader from Barbados, traveled to Boston in 1647 and purchased an Indian named Hope from Susanna Winslow with the assistance of the governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony himself, John Winthrop.<sup>25</sup>

Despite what eventually seemed to be a general presumption against the enslavement of Indians under normal circumstances, in times of warfare it took little effort—or justification—to enslave Indian men, women, and children, either locally or abroad. The Pequot War (1636–38)

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 8: 143.

<sup>23</sup> Absolute numbers for the Indian population on Barbados are very difficult to find. A 1684 Barbados census indicated seventy-two Indians were on the island, but, given the high mortality rate for enslaved people generally on Barbados during the period 1627–84, hundreds of Indians must have been imported over time to reach the 1684 level of seventy-two (if this 1684 census is even accurate). Mortality rates for Africans give some sense of this need to constantly bring in additional slaves to keep a stable labor force: Edward Littleton, a prominent Barbados planter, reported in 1680 that he had to purchase six new slaves each year just to keep his slave workforce stable at 120. Additionally, the 1684 census took place after the purging of New England Indians from the island, so the numbers were likely greater in early 1676 than in 1684. See Dunn, *WMQ* 26: 26. On the 1684 census, see Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 56.

<sup>24</sup> Richard Ligon, *A True & Exact History Of the Island of Barbados*. . . . (London, 1657), 54.

<sup>25</sup> For an analysis of Barbados planters’ reliance on Indian labor, see Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 39, 46. Regarding John Manniford’s purchase of Hope, see “This writing indented. . . .” in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 3d ser., vol. 1 (Boston, 1825), 27. See also “Bill of Sale,” in *Winthrop Papers*, 5: 196–97. The transaction was a bit complicated. The bill of sale is in Winthrop’s hand with the original signature of the purchaser, but it states that Edward Winslow was in England at the time, so Susanna Winslow took care of the transaction with Winthrop’s assistance. Hope was a “servant to the said mr. Winslow.” Additionally, the term of the sale was limited to ten years, with the typical “Orders and Customs of English servants” on Barbados in effect. Ibid., 5: 197. It is unclear if, after this time, Hope would be returned to Winslow or be given his freedom. See also the brief mention of this transaction in Larry D. Gragg, “The Early New England-Barbados Trade,” *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* 17, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 177–200, esp. 183.

therefore represented one of the first times English colonists resorted to large-scale enslavement as a means of subduing a rebellious Native nation, although precedents in Virginia's 1622 war against the Powhatans must have been influential.<sup>26</sup> Once New Englanders had defeated, subjugated, enslaved, and (unsuccessfully) attempted to exterminate even the name of the Pequots in New England, presumptions against Indian enslavement returned to the prewar state in which Indians were assumed to be free peoples; it was therefore not permissible to enslave Natives without adequate cause. Yet when fighting broke out across New England in the mid-1670s in what later was called King Philip's War, colonists immediately turned to the mass enslavement of "rebel" Indians once again.<sup>27</sup> Following what was by then a well-established practice, New Englanders shipped captive Narragansetts, Wampanoags, and Nipmucs to various destinations around the Atlantic world, likely hoping to tap into a ready market on islands desperate for slave labor of any kind. Capturing and selling Indians into foreign enslavement was understood as accomplishing several goals at once, including ridding the country of rebellious Natives and raising money to pay off costs incurred by the colonies during the war. Such enslavement started early in the war; in late September 1675, Plymouth magistrates authorized the shipment of 178 enslaved New England Indians to Cadiz, Spain, and others soon followed to other destinations around the Atlantic world.<sup>28</sup> Given its strong trade connections with New England and its prior utility as a destination for recalcitrant New England Indians, Barbados also served as a regular destination for King Philip's rebels—whose presence likely represented a significant increase in Natives from New England on the island. But Barbados planters were more discriminating than New

<sup>26</sup> On the ways in which New England colonists often viewed New England Indians as barbarians or heathens who did not possess their own sovereignty (and, therefore, as perfectly acceptable targets of total European-style warfare), see Ronald Dale Karr, "Why Should You Be So Furious? The Violence of the Pequot War," *Journal of American History* 85, no. 3 (December 1998): 876–909, esp. 907. For Indian captives taken during the 1622 war in Virginia, see C. S. Everett, "They shalbe slaves for their lives": Indian Slavery in Colonial Virginia," in Galloway, *Indian Slavery in Colonial America*, 67–108, esp. 69.

<sup>27</sup> New England colonists viewed the conflict as an Indian rebellion, as the various accounts of the war suggested. See for example [Benjamin Church and] T[homas] C[hurch], *Entertaining Passages Relating to Philip's War Which Began in the Month of June, 1675. As Also of Expeditions More Lately Made Against the Common Enemy, and Indian Rebels, in the Eastern Parts of New-England: With Some Account of the Divine Providence Towards Benj. Church Esqr* (Boston, 1716).

<sup>28</sup> The selling of Indian captives to pay off war debts was especially common during King Philip's War. See Lepore, *Name of War*, 154. For the shipment from Plymouth to Cales (Cadiz), see [Nathaniel Saltonstall], *The Present State of New-England, With Respect to the Indian War: Wherein is an Account of the true Reason thereof, (as far as can be Judged by Men.) Together with most of the Remarkable Passages that have happened from the 20th of June, till the 10th of November, 1675* (London, 1675), 6.

England magistrates and merchants had anticipated. Although it is not clear when the first shipment of New England Natives arrived in Barbados, by April 1676 enough Natives were present that owners and magistrates alike had had enough. On April 21 the Assembly of Barbados ordered “a Bill to be drawne to prohibit the bringing of Indian slaves from New England to this Island,” without any additional commentary, and such a bill was presented to and passed in the assembly on June 14 of that year.<sup>29</sup> Once again, even this initial order makes plain that the sole targets of this law were the New England Natives captured during King Philip’s War and sent to Barbados as slaves.

Why were New England Natives so undesirable to Barbados planters? Some historians have suggested that perhaps the reasons lay in the fact that New England Indians “were not proving to be an efficient agricultural slave labor force.”<sup>30</sup> Others have suggested general fear of New England Indians; as Jill Lepore has noted, New Englanders themselves had been publishing damning reports that highlighted the supposedly violent and ruthless nature of the New England Natives during King Philip’s War.<sup>31</sup> But this June 1676 act reveals that there was another, more important reason, one rooted in the experience of Barbadians themselves and directly connected to attempted revolts of another kind.

In May 1675, a full month before Wampanoags first attacked Swansea in Plymouth, white planters on Barbados discovered, to their immense horror, what they believed to be a full-fledged plot hatched by their African slaves to rid the island of whites entirely.<sup>32</sup> The plan had been to signal

<sup>29</sup> Journal of the Assembly of Barbados, Apr. 21, June 14, 1676, CO 31/2, pp. 221 (quotation), 224, NA.

<sup>30</sup> John McWilliams, “Indian John and the Northern Tawnies,” in *New England Encounters: Indians and Euroamericans, ca. 1600–1850: Essays Drawn from “The New England Quarterly,”* ed. Alden T. Vaughan (Boston, 1999), 157–78, esp. 176 n. 8. Richard S. Dunn suggests similar reasons, although he is relying on a report from the governor of Jamaica in 1676: Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 74. See also Lauber, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times*, 127; Douglas Edward Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk* (New York, 1966), 226.

<sup>31</sup> Lepore, *Name of War*, 168. Lepore indicates that it was the “New Englanders’ vicious words of war” that made these New England Natives “almost entirely unmarketable” (ibid.). See the discussion on 117–18 about how similar language was used to describe Caribs on islands close to Barbados in this same period, however.

<sup>32</sup> The best accounts of this conspiracy are *Great Newes from the Barbadoes; or, A True and Faithful Account of the Grand Conspiracy of The Negroes against the English. And The Happy Discovery of the same. With The number of those that were burned alive, Beheaded, and otherwise Executed for their Horrid Crimes. With a short Discription of that Plantation* (London, 1676), 9–13; [Nathaniel Saltonstall], *A Continuation Of the State of New-England: Being a Farther Account of the Indian Warr . . . Together with an Account of the intended Rebellion of the Negroes in the Barbadoes* (London, 1676), 19–20. Secondary analyses of this attempted revolt can be found in Handler, *New West Indian Guide! Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 56: 13–19; Handler, *Journal of the Barbados Museum and Historical Society* 36: 312–33; Susan Dwyer Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges: Slavery and*

between plantations all over the island during the night using “Trumpets to be made of Elephants Teeth” and locally available gourds as noisemakers, to set fire to the vast sugarcane fields, and to slit the throats of their hated masters. When the entire island was in their hands, the Africans intended to crown an elderly man named Coffee as a “King” to lead them; he was to be given a “Chair of State exquisitely wrought and Carved after their Mode” and accompanied by a royal procession.<sup>33</sup> Given the demographic imbalance on the island in favor of the enslaved Africans, this plan must have seemed plausible for both the planners and—upon discovery—the intended targets. The plot was foiled a mere eight days before its execution, however, when one of Justice Gyles Hall’s female slaves, Anna, overheard two Coromantee Africans disagreeing over the merits of the rebellion. Anna immediately reported the conversation to her master, who promptly forced the two Coromantees to give the full details of the plot. Within a few days, approximately one hundred accused conspiracy leaders were imprisoned and brought before a hastily assembled court. Seventeen were immediately found guilty and publicly executed: six were burned alive and eleven were beheaded, with their headless corpses dragged through the streets of Speightstown and burned. Twenty-five more accused conspirators were later executed, while sixty languished in prison awaiting trial (five of whom hanged themselves).<sup>34</sup> That this revolt had been “Clandestinely” planned for three years prior to its discovery only added to the insecurity felt by the planters.<sup>35</sup>

In response to this attempted African revolt, the Assembly of Barbados passed a series of acts intended to increase the safety and protection of the planters while minimizing the conditions in which Africans could again plan a rebellion. In addition to approving an act coordinating a militia on the island, the assembly significantly updated and expanded its original slave code, which had been passed in 1661 as “An Act for the better ordering and governing of Negroes.”<sup>36</sup> The assembly ordered an initial draft of

---

*the Transformation of English Society, 1640–1700* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2007), 159–61. For the connections between Indian and African rebellions in the Atlantic world, see Jill Lepore, *New York Burning: Liberty, Slavery, and Conspiracy in Eighteenth-Century Manhattan* (New York, 2005), 10–12.

<sup>33</sup> *Great Neues from the Barbadoes*, 10 (“Trumpets”), 9 (“King”).

<sup>34</sup> [Saltonstall], *A Continuation of the State of New-England*, 19; *Great Neues from the Barbadoes*, 10–12.

<sup>35</sup> *Great Neues from the Barbadoes*, 9. Reports of such conspiracies were always filtered through the lens of planters and magistrates, and confessions were often extracted through torture and threats. Given such realities, some scholars have argued that conspiracy reports and confessions were part of a larger Atlantic world conspiracy genre that in some cases did not reflect real threats or occurrences on the ground. See for example Jason T. Sharples, “The Flames of Insurrection: Fearing Slave Conspiracy in Early America 1670–1780” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2010).

<sup>36</sup> See for example “An Act for the Settlement of the militia of this Island,” passed on Sept. 20, 1675, CO 31/2, p. 193, NA. For the 1661 Barbados slave code, see CO 30/2,

this updated slave code on July 7, 1675, and passed a preliminary version on August 31 but requested some more modifications before passing the bill again on April 21, 1676, as “A Supplementall Act to a former Act Intituled an Act for the better ordering and Governing of negroes.”<sup>37</sup> Building on the lengthy 1661 series of laws aimed at enslaved Africans, this supplemental act was designed to restrict their activity and mobility as well as increase the punishment for theft, threats against whites, rebellious activity, and rape.<sup>38</sup> The 1676 supplemental act made it a capital offense for enslaved blacks to “Steal or wilfully kill maime or destroy” horses, cattle, sheep, goats, hogs, or any other livestock, or even to threaten the owner of such animals while attempting such vandalism, even if in the end no animals were stolen or hurt. Petty theft for items valued at less than twelve pence was punishable by public whipping for the first offense, having the offender’s nose slit and forehead branded “with a hot Iron that the marke thereof may remaine” for the second offense, and death for the third offense. Because the planters and Barbados magistrates observed that enslaved Africans who were loaned to other planters or households posed more of a threat to public safety through their “moveing from Plantation to Plantation,” and thereby “have more opportunity of Contrivance of Mischiefe and Rebellion,” the assembly levied a fine of one thousand pounds of muscovado sugar for each individual that planters continued to loan out as slaves from their plantations. The assembly likewise prohibited planters from allowing their extra slaves to “goe abroad and use and exercise their Own Wills” to find employment (presumably for the benefit of the masters); masters who broke that law, the assembly mandated, would lose these slaves entirely.<sup>39</sup> To keep skilled Africans out of trades (and thereby open up more space for poor white tradesmen), the assembly prohibited any additional slaves from being taught trades, including blacksmithing and sailing.<sup>40</sup>

---

pp. 16–26, NA. For a discussion of that 1661 law, see Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges*, 130–34. Such slave codes were commonly enacted across the British Atlantic world in areas where slave labor was increasingly relied on for the production of sugar, tobacco, and other export products. Earlier versions may have existed in Barbados, but they have not survived.

<sup>37</sup> CO 31/2, pp. 185, 188, 190, 221, NA. The Journal of the Assembly of Barbados mentions that this act was read and passed, but it does not give the actual text of the act. The full text of this “Supplementall Act” can be found in “Transcript Acts,” 410–20.

<sup>38</sup> For a brief analysis of this 1676 “Supplementall Act,” see Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges*, 135–38.

<sup>39</sup> “Supplementall Act,” in “Transcript Acts,” 411 (“Steal”), 412 (“hot Iron”), 415 (“moveing”). Muscovado sugar was the most commonly produced sugar in Barbados and the other sugar islands in the seventeenth century. Since it was so commonly available, it served as a sort of currency in Barbados, much like tobacco did in Virginia. Although it had already been through an initial refinement process, it was still a dark, moist brown sugar that usually required further refinement in England before consumption by Europeans (who preferred white, or clayed, sugar). See Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 195–96.

<sup>40</sup> “Supplementall Act,” in “Transcript Acts,” 416–17. The lengthy list of trades suggests the many ways skilled enslaved Africans were already utilized on the island.



The heaviest restrictions within the supplemental act, however, explicitly targeted the activity that allowed the 1675 slave conspiracy to transpire in the first place. Africans were prohibited from leaving their owners' plantations at any time—and especially “on Saturday Nights Sundayes or other Holy-dayes”—without a letter or ticket from their owners unless they were accompanied by a “whiteman.” Any free person was authorized to require such documentation to be produced and, in its absence, to “Apprehend and take up” such blacks and turn them over to the authorities for a “Moderate whipping.” Enslaved Africans were similarly prohibited from carrying clubs or other “offensive” weapons, from holding any public meeting or feast (especially one that involved “strange Negroes”), and from beating drums, blowing horns, or playing other loud instruments; planters were required to conduct a weekly search of the slave quarters for such instruments and, in the event they might be discovered, to have them burned.<sup>41</sup> Runaway African slaves were to be put to death.<sup>42</sup> Virtually every aspect of this supplemental act limited even further the already restricted activity and social space of enslaved Africans on Barbados, all with an eye toward reducing the kind of communication and agency that led to the 1675 plot against the planters.

This April 1676 supplemental act targeted enslaved Africans; two months later, however, the assembly applied each and every part of the act to *all* slaves, including Natives from New England. The same day that the assembly passed the supplemental act regarding Africans (April 21, 1676), it also ordered that a bill be drawn to prohibit the importation of “Indian slaves from New England.”<sup>43</sup> When the assembly next met in June (the records do not indicate a May meeting), one of the first things on the agenda was the bill to prohibit the importation of New England Indian slaves. But by June, enough time had passed that the members of the assembly decided they also needed to explain the supplemental act concerning Africans, so they coupled that explanation with the new bill for prohibiting importation of New England Indian slaves. This combined bill received sustained attention over the course of two days, June 13 and 14, and its importance and contentiousness is conveyed by the fact that it was debated and brought to a vote three times during those two days—each

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 417 (“Holy-dayes”), 418 (“strange Negroes”). For more on the failed 1675 African revolt as a turning point against African evangelization, see Katharine Gerbner, “The Ultimate Sin: Christianising Slaves in Barbados in the Seventeenth Century,” *Slavery and Abolition* 31, no. 1 (March 2010): 57–73.

<sup>42</sup> “Supplementall Act,” in “Transcript Acts,” 418. Death was mandated only if the runaway had lived on Barbados for more than a year and had been absent for a month. These were not empty threats. On Dec. 9, 1684, £21.17.6 sterling was paid to Timothy Thornhill Barronett for “a negro of his” who was condemned and executed “for running away according to a law of this Island.” See Barbados Council Minutes, 421, Barbados Department of Archives.

<sup>43</sup> Journal of the Assembly of Barbados, Apr. 21, 1676, CO 31/2, p. 221, NA.



time passed in the affirmative, discussed, amended, discussed, and passed again. Finally, on June 14, 1676, the completed act was read and passed into law with the full title “An Act of Explanation to the Act of Negroes, and to prohibit the bringing of Indians to this Island.”<sup>44</sup>

And what, in fact, was the explanation regarding the “Act of Negroes”? Simply that “all and every Acts of this Island restrayneing and punishing the Offences and Crimes of Negroes were Intended to Comprehend and extend to All manner of Slaves remaineing in this Island, As well Indyans, Madagascars as other Slaves.”<sup>45</sup> It was not merely secretarial convenience, then, that caused the act for prohibiting the importation of New England Indians to Barbados to be coupled with an act intending to clarify a prior act relating to Africans.<sup>46</sup> These two acts were combined precisely because New England Natives represented all of the traits and conditions—to a greater degree—that planters believed allowed their African slaves to cook up a rebellion in the first place. So great was the danger, the assembly believed, that Barbados should be purged of New England Natives entirely.

The opening paragraph of the June 1676 act accomplished two things. First, it extended the terms of the “Act of Negroes” to the recently arrived New England Indians and all other enslaved people on the island. Second, it made a capital offense of attempted rape by any slave, Indian or African, particularly in a case where the “Christian” (and thus presumably white) victim was made to fear for her life. The entirety of the remainder of the act was devoted specifically to the recently arrived Indians from the New England region. This was made clear by the opening sentence of the second paragraph, which explicitly named “the Indians brought from New England, New Yorke, Roade Island and the Collonyes adjacent.” The act prohibited unequivocally, from the date of its passage, June 14, 1676, that any Indian from New England or neighboring colonies should be brought to Barbados. The hefty cost of breaking this law revealed the depth of the assembly’s concern: any “Master or Commander” who was caught bringing “Such Indian or Indians into any Harbour or Creeke of this Island” or “on Shoare” would lose his ship, as well as everything on it, and be summoned to court, and his ship would not be returned until he could provide evidence that the Indians from New England on his ship were “in a readinesse to be carried from this Island.”<sup>47</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Although the details of the discussion and amendments are not recorded, record of the three votes and the additions can be found in *Journal of the Assembly of Barbados*, June 13–14, 1676, CO 31/2, pp. 223–24, NA.

<sup>45</sup> “An Act of Explanation to the Act of Negroes, and to Prohibite the Bringing of Indians to This Island,” in “Transcript Acts,” 421.

<sup>46</sup> Indeed, such connections were also made—however inadvertently—by Nathaniel Saltonstall, who bound together his second report about King Philip’s War in New England with a report of the attempted African rebellion in Barbados. See [Saltonstall], *A Continuation of the State of New-England*; Lepore, *Name of War*, 167.

<sup>47</sup> “Act of Explanation,” in “Transcript Acts,” 421–22 (“Christian,” 421, “readiness,” 422). Regarding the construction of “Christian” servants vis-à-vis African and

It was not enough for the assembly to merely prohibit the further importation of New England Natives; it desired also to get rid of the "Indians already in this Island." Accordingly, the act made two additional requirements and provisions. First, the assembly required that "Every Owner or possessor" of any Indians from the New England region had six months to "Send away and export" them, the cost of which—should it not be possible to sell them to a merchant—would be borne by the master.<sup>48</sup> The cost of noncompliance, however, was even higher. Masters who refused to ship their enslaved New England Indians out of Barbados were required to pay a stiff fine of ten thousand pounds of muscovado sugar per New England Indian.<sup>49</sup> This amount was precisely twice the value of the life of an enslaved African as set out in the April 1676 supplemental act.<sup>50</sup> No master attending to his financial interests would have paid this amount merely for the privilege of retaining an enslaved individual—African or Indian—with such a despised local and international status.

Somewhat surprisingly, a provision was included in the law for more recent purchases. For masters who had purchased their enslaved New England Indians within six months before the passage of this law—after January 14, 1676—the act required the sellers of such Indians to take them back, which placed the costs of exportation and resale on the backs of the merchants who had made the sales in the first place. Masters merely had to take their New England Indian slaves to the "Factor Agent or Attorney" of the sellers, which freed them from the onerous fine imposed by the assembly and any former obligations placed in writing by the original bill of sale.<sup>51</sup> Such returns had a limited window, however; the act stipulated they must be made within a month of its publication, presumably by the middle

---

Indian slaves in the Caribbean, see Edward B. Rugemer, "The Development of Mastery and Race in the Comprehensive Slave Codes of the Greater Caribbean during the Seventeenth Century," *WMQ* 70, no. 3 (July 2013): 429–58. Although the wording of this act slightly expands the prohibition against New England Indians to include those from New York, the boundaries of what constituted New England were a bit permeable in this document (earlier the act separated out Rhode Island from New England).

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 422 (quotations).

<sup>49</sup> By some estimates, muscovado sugar could be sold for approximately £15 per fifteen hundred pounds in this time period. If ten thousand pounds of muscovado sugar was worth roughly £100, this fine was intended to be particularly onerous, since it was at least two, if not three, times the value of an Indian slave. For a discussion of the nature and worth of muscovado sugar, see Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 195–96.

<sup>50</sup> "Supplementall Act," in "Transcript Acts," 413. Five thousand pounds of muscovado sugar was the maximum amount that could be claimed per African life; often the amount was less. On Feb. 17, 1684, Jun Tull petitioned the Barbados council for a payment of four thousand pounds of muscovado sugar that had been ordered due to him by the justices of the peace "according to a law of this Island for the loss of a negroe man of his killed by another negroe." Barbados Council Minutes, Feb. 17, 1684, 38.

<sup>51</sup> "Act of Explanation," in "Transcript Acts," 423.

of July 1676. After that short grace period, the full penalty of the act—the fine of ten thousand pounds of sugar—would be enforced.<sup>52</sup>

Throughout the text of the June 1676 act, the wording makes explicit the precise concerns that drove the assembly to pass this piece of legislation. Most importantly—particularly in light of the attempted 1675 conspiracy—the assembly feared that with the introduction of New England Natives, “greater mischief may happen to this Island then [*sic*] from any Negroes.” If African slaves were able to concoct an uprising on their own, the logic of the act indicated, the presence of Natives who had already proved themselves capable of coordinating and participating in a devastating pan-Indian revolt in their home context would greatly increase the threat of another such uprising. To make this point perfectly clear, the act repeated it. On the very next page, the assembly again declared they were “fully Apprehensive of the great Evills the Indians allready in this Island from New England & places adjacent may bring upon this Place if they should continue here they being of a Subtle and dangerous Nature and able more cunningly to contrive and carry on those dangerous designs which our Negroes of the[ir] Owne Nature are prone unto.”<sup>53</sup>

The specific negative descriptors of Natives from New England illustrated both word-of-mouth information and the personal experience of Barbadian planters. Even before their arrival, the act stated, these New England Indians were “knowne to be Notorious Villanyes,” a forewarned reputation proved correct by experience: “by the bringing of Such Indians to this place is found they are such obstinate Incorrigible Rogues and Cunning Thieves.”<sup>54</sup> A similar situation developed in New England in the 1710s, when Indians enslaved during the Tuscarora War in the American Southeast were shipped to New England. New England colonies quickly prohibited the importation of “Carolina” Indian slaves, citing the fact that they were “in open hostility against his Majesties subjects there, and have committed many cruel and bloody outrages upon them.”<sup>55</sup>

The most pressing concern regarding New England Indian slaves, then, was the fact that they were warriors, already engaged in an effective,

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 422–23.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 421 (“greater mischief”), 422 (“fully Apprehensive”).

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 421.

<sup>55</sup> “At a Meeting of the Governour and Council in New London, July 8th, 1715,” in Charles J. Hoadly, ed., *The Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut*. . . (Hartford, Conn., 1870), 5: 516 (quotations). English officials used the imprecise and made-up label of “Carolina Indians” for any and all Natives from the region, thereby ignoring actual tribal identities. Rhode Island passed a law with similar language in the same year. See “An Act prohibiting the importation, or bringing into this colony any Indian servants or slaves,” in John Russell Bartlett, ed., *Records of the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England* (1859; repr., New York, 1968), 4: 193–94. For a discussion of the New England context, see Galloway, *Indian Slave Trade*, 301–2; Newell, “Indian Slavery in Colonial New England,” 50–51.

coordinated attack on English colonies, who might effectively mobilize a large African population against the English in Barbados. As gleaned from his correspondence during this same period, Governor Atkins and other Barbadians erroneously imagined a carefully orchestrated pan-Indian uprising in North America, spreading from New England, one colony at a time, southward into Virginia. Atkins received direct reports of the “dayly Devastations made by the Indians,” which were “catching like a Contagion spreading it self over all the continent *from New England*,” as evidenced from Indian uprisings in Virginia, Maryland, and even New York.<sup>56</sup> From the distant Caribbean perspective, New England Indians were responsible not only for what historians later called King Philip’s War in New England but also for Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia. The same Indians who were now arriving on Barbados as slaves had already participated in the “Destruction of the people & the spoyle of their goods” in North America.<sup>57</sup>

But there was more. New England Natives were not just warriors with a demonstrated capacity for coordinating devastating attacks on English colonies; Atkins also credited them with a degree of Christianization at the hands of the Puritans that gave them an acute moral sense of injustice and a conviction in their rebellion: “they have learnt them the Art of praying & by their Doctrine the knowledge of right & wrong which gives them a confidence the lands the English enjoy are properly theirs.”<sup>58</sup> Atkins implied that if Natives were willing to coordinate a pan-Indian uprising over the issue of land loss, they would never tolerate outright enslavement. Although the 1676 act does not refer to it, Atkins’s commentary also alludes to the very complicated situation in which Barbadians could have actually been receiving Christian Indians who had been wrongfully dispossessed and perhaps even wrongfully enslaved according to English standards.<sup>59</sup> But whatever Christianization had taken place, Atkins seemed convinced it had been smothered by a demonic rebelliousness that was unlikely to be remediable by spiritual means. In his view, the Natives had “imbibd something of the spirit of rebellion a divell that I doubt will not be layd with prayers & ffasting.”<sup>60</sup> Either way, with

<sup>56</sup> Governor Jonathan Atkins to Joseph Williamson, Apr. 3, 1676, CO 1/36, p. 70 (emphasis added).

<sup>57</sup> Atkins to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, Feb. 3, 1676, Barbados Entry Book, 1675–80, CO 29/2, pp. 55–56, NA.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56, NA.

<sup>59</sup> Such awareness of wrongful dispossession was part of the wider rhetoric of English colonial administration and certainly was a claim Atkins took seriously. In 1665 the Lords of Trade and Plantations reprimanded the Massachusetts Bay magistrates for their policies regarding Indian land claims: “it seemes as if they were dispossessed of their land by Scripture, which is both against the hoñor of God & the justice of the king.” See Nicolls et al. to the Massachusetts General Court, May 24, 1665, in Shurtleff, *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay*, vol. 4, pt. 2, 213.

<sup>60</sup> Atkins to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, Feb. 3, 1676, Barbados Entry Book, 1675–80, CO 29/2, p. 56, NA. Atkins and other magistrates apparently thought evangelization and Christianization of Africans might embolden them too, since one of

the attempted African slave revolt so fresh in the local collective memory and with Indian wars still under way in New England and Virginia, Atkins was determined not to let Barbados be the next colony infected with Native rebellion. The point in prohibiting further importation of enslaved New England Indians and requiring those who had already arrived to be shipped off again, as the act made clear, was to make absolutely certain that the white inhabitants of Barbados would be spared the “much harme and prejudice” that would be sure to follow should New England Indians be allowed “more cunningly to contrive and carry on those dangerous designes” with the resident African population.<sup>61</sup>

Despite the great lengths taken to remove New England Natives from Barbados, this act was not designed to end Indian enslavement as a whole on the island, nor was it primarily a reflection of any moral concerns about Indian enslavement in general. The specific wording of the June 1676 act reveals that it did not indicate a “bizarre fear of Indians,” as one historian has argued, nor was it intended to curb the general importation of Indian slaves into Barbados aside from those from New England.<sup>62</sup> But given the broader context of the English Caribbean in this period, it is puzzling that the Assembly of Barbados so selectively singled out New England Natives, given that other Indian groups on nearby islands were also engaged in warfare against the English, were also teaming up with African runaways, and were also being imported as slaves to Barbados. The decade prior to this June 1676 act was full of inconclusive warfare with Carib Indians on Antigua, Montserrat, Saint Vincent, and Dominica. During an expedition on Dominica in 1668, Colonel James Walker had specific commands from Barbados governor William Willoughby to capture rebellious Indians and send them to Barbados as slaves. Even more immediately, in December 1674, Indians on Antigua launched a devastating attack on the English settlements.<sup>63</sup> Cumulatively, these ongoing Caribbean Indian wars caused

---

the several laws passed in the wake of the 1675 African conspiracy was an act titled “An Act to prevent the People called Quakers, from bringing Negroes to their Meeting.” See *Journal of the Assembly of Barbados*, Apr. 2, 1676, CO 30/1, p. 97, NA. See also Gerbner, *Slavery and Abolition* 31: 57–73.

<sup>61</sup> “Act of Explanation,” in “Transcript Acts,” 421–22 (“harme,” 421, “dangerous designes,” 422).

<sup>62</sup> Elaine G. Breslaw, “The Salem Witch from Barbados: In Search of Tituba’s Roots,” *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 128, no. 4 (October 1992): 217–38 (quotation, 220). For interpretations of this act as outlawing all Indian enslavement, see Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 57; Breslaw, *Tituba, Reluctant Witch of Salem*, 31–32.

<sup>63</sup> Handler, *Caribbean Studies* 8: 50. Handler places this June 1676 act in the context of the Antigua attacks and reprisals, but there is little direct evidence that this act was a response to these developments on Antigua or the ongoing warfare with nearby Caribs. Nonetheless, it seems plausible that these other, more local, Caribbean Indian revolts also influenced local legislation at some level, even if this influence is not reflected in the assembly’s proceedings or the act itself.

English officials to use the same scathing language as had been directed toward New England Natives: these Carib Indians were widely reported to be “treacherous and perfidious Infidells, watching and takeing all opportunities to robb, Murther and Committ outrages, wheresoeuer they could Surprize or take opportunitie upon any of his Majestyes Subjects, Not onely here, but upon the Island of Nevis, Antegua, Mountserratt anguilla and Barbuda, Leaueing many and Lamentable Spectacles of their Cruelty upon many of his Majestyes Subjects that haue beene most Inhumanly Butchered, Others, Miserably mangled and Left weltering in their Blood, Others Dismembred And an Innumerable other Villanies not to be Invented or mentioned by any Christian.”<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, this ongoing warfare illustrated the power of Indian-African collaboration: as the governor of the Leeward Islands, William Stapleton, reported in late 1675, out of the fifteen hundred Indian “bowmen” in Saint Vincent, Dominica, and Saint Lucia, a full six hundred were actually “negroes” who had either escaped from ships wrecked on the islands’ shores or “run away from Barbadoes” and elsewhere and were fighting with local Natives against the English.<sup>65</sup>

Given these reports and the likelihood of enslaved Caribs also being sent to Barbados (as directed by the governor himself), the assembly could have taken the opportunity to outlaw all enslaved Indian importation in June 1676, especially those who were in open rebellion against the English, whether in Antigua, Saint Vincent, or New England. It did not do so, however; it only targeted New England Indians. Therefore, this 1676 act was specific and highly pragmatic. Barbadians were afraid, but not of all Indians: such concerns were primarily related to New England Indians and were great enough, in fact, for the assembly to write an entire law aimed exclusively against their importation to and ownership on Barbados. Enslaved Indians from other parts of the Atlantic world could be and were purchased by planters on Barbados in the years following King Philip’s War and the 1676 act. The Salem, Massachusetts, minister Samuel Parris likely purchased Tituba (who later became famous during the Salem witch trials) there after he arrived in 1678, along with Tituba’s future husband, Indian John.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Governor Stapleton to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, Apr. 26, 1676, CO 1/36, pp. 52i–52xiii (quotation, 52xii), 52, NA. See also “An Account of His Majesty’s Island of Barbados and the Government thereof,” Feb. 3, 1676, CO 29/2, pp. 1–14, NA.

<sup>65</sup> “Answer to inquiries sent to Colonel Stapleton, Governor of the Leeward Islands, by command of the Lords of Trade and Plantations by Sir Robert Southwell,” [late 1675], CO 1/38, p. 158, NA. The date of this document is unclear. It was marked as received by the Lords of Trade and Plantations in January 1676, so a late-1675 dating seems likely. Regarding the bowmen, see also the report of Governor Atkins of Barbados, who gave the same number of Native bowmen and escaped Africans on these islands but seemed to only associate the African runaways with St. Vincent. “An account of His Majesty’s Island of Barbadoes and the Government thereof,” February 1676, CO 29/2, pp. 12–13, NA.

<sup>66</sup> Breslaw, *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 128: 220; Elaine G. Breslaw, “Tituba’s Confession: The Multicultural Dimensions of the 1692 Salem Witch-Hunt,” *Ethnohistory* 44, no. 3 (Summer 1997): 535–56, esp. 537.



Barbadian concerns regarding New England Indians influenced their reception on at least one other island in the English Caribbean. On Jamaica, word of the foiled Barbados African revolt of May 1675 combined with the Barbados law against the importation of New England Indians prompted the Jamaica Assembly to pass similar laws.<sup>67</sup> On December 12, 1676, the Governor's Council of Jamaica declared that since some Indians from New England had already been imported and the governor and his council regarded them as a "great hazard & danger" to the island, no ship captain was allowed to import any additional Indian men after December 12, 1676, or any additional Indian women after February 12, 1677.<sup>68</sup> But this Jamaica act was simultaneously more stringent and less rigorous than the Barbados act. Though it prohibited the importation of any and all Indian slaves after February 12, 1677, it did not require those individuals who had already purchased Indian slaves to ship them away from the island. That these islands' governments took such drastic steps despite a clear labor shortage on both Barbados and Jamaica in the mid-1670s further highlights the perceived danger these New England Indians represented.<sup>69</sup>

Comparing the June 1676 Barbados act to an act passed just a few years later in the colony of New York throws the significance of the former into greater relief. On April 20, 1680, the New York legislature passed a law that essentially outlawed all future Indian enslavement. "Resolved That all Indyans here *have Always been and* are free, and not Slaves, nor forc't to bee Servants," the act brazenly and misleadingly proclaimed. The main focus of the order, however, was on enslaved Indians brought from the Spanish Caribbean, particularly from the Bay of Campeche in the southern Gulf of Mexico and "other forraigne parts." If any additional enslaved Indians were imported to the colony of New York within six months of the passing of this

<sup>67</sup> On Sept. 3, 1675, the Governor's Council on Jamaica read "several advices" sent from Barbados describing the "late Rebellion" there. In response the council ordered that "no Negroes concerned in ye late Rebellion, or convicted of any other Crime in BB [Barbados] & transported hither be permitted to be bought or sold" in Jamaica. See CO 140/3, p. 436, NA.

<sup>68</sup> "At a Councill held at Port Royall," Dec. 12, 1676, in "Continuation of ye Council Book of Jamaica," CO 140/3, pp. 535–36, NA. The order to make such a proclamation also makes clear the inclusive nature of the prohibition, requiring that "that Proclamation be issued immediately for prohibiting the landing of Indians from New England or any other places." See Sainsbury, *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, 9: 507–14.

<sup>69</sup> See for example various 1676 entries in the Barbados Entry Book, 1675–80, CO 29/2, pp. 100–107, NA. In late 1675 Barbados governor Jonathan Atkins sent the Lords of Trade and Plantations a listing of "The Grievances of Barbados," one of which was a complaint about "the scarcity of negroe slaves, and the immoderate Rates they are sold at by the Royall African Company." See Journal of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, February 1674–March 1676, CO 391/1, p. 236, NA. Regarding Jamaica, see Sir Thomas Lynch to Lords of Trade and Plantations, Aug. 29, 1682, CO 1/49, p. 35, NA.



bill, there was a six-month leniency period during which their owners could turn around and sell them outside of New York, whether to the Caribbean or other parts of North America. But six months after the passage of the bill, all enslaved Indians brought to New York were declared to be “Free Indynans.”<sup>70</sup>

It is possible this New York law was not always perfectly enforced; it did not stop James Barré from transporting and selling a load of thirteen Indians (seemingly from the Spanish Caribbean, if the names listed are any indication) in June and July of that same year.<sup>71</sup> The contrasts between Barbados and New York are striking, however. New York prohibited, in theory at least, Indian slavery in any form, including enslavement of those brought from abroad, and made provisions for those who had been brought to be sent away or freed immediately. Barbados, by contrast, went to great lengths in the 1676 act to target Indians from New England, prohibiting their further importation and requiring their owners—under threat of a hefty fine—to turn them in or sell them abroad immediately, all while leaving the hundreds of Indians from other locales who were enslaved or working in unfree situations completely untouched. The Assembly of Barbados was merely trying to deal with a perceived problem from New England Natives; they had no intention of outlawing the importation of all Indian slaves (as in Jamaica) or in providing freedom for those who remained (as in New York).

It was not until December 1688 that the Assembly of Barbados passed a broader law against Indian slave importation. Once again it was bundled with an act regarding African enslavement. At the very end of “An Act for the securing the Possession of Negroes and Slaves,” the law forbade any person “to bring, sell and dispose of any *Indians* to this Island.”<sup>72</sup> Although it is not clear from the act what prompted this broader prohibition, this December 1688 law followed immediately on the heels of a series of laws passed on the island that year in response to an attempted 1685–86 slave

<sup>70</sup> Orders for the emancipation of Indians, and for regulating the registry and assignment of indentured servants, in Peter R. Christoph and Florence A. Christoph, eds., *The Andros Papers, 1679–1680: Files of the Provincial Secretary of New York during the Administration of Governor Sir Edmund Andros, 1674–1680* [vol. 3], trans. Charles T. Gehring (Syracuse, N.Y., 1991), 264–65 (quotations, 264). This document was drawn up on Apr. 10, 1680, and published on Apr. 20, 1680. For a seeming draft of a similarly worded order in December 1679, see Order for the manumission of native Indian slaves, and ending the importation of foreign ones, Dec. 5, 1679, *ibid.*, 174–75.

<sup>71</sup> List of Indian slaves imported and sold by James Barré, *ibid.*, 173–74. This document is undated, but the editorial note in the *Andros Papers* convincingly uses circumstantial evidence to date it to mid-1680, after the New York Indian emancipation act was passed.

<sup>72</sup> “An Act for the securing the Possession of Negroes and Slaves,” Dec. 18, 1688, in Rawlin, *Laws of Barbados*, 169–71 (quotation, 171). Rawlin gives the full text of this act, only the very last paragraph of which deals with Indians. A marginal note clarifies that “*Indians* [were] not to be sold or imported here.” *Ibid.*, 171.

uprising in Barbados. Additionally, a precious few records indicate that well into the 1680s merchant ships were still taking Indian slaves to Barbados, particularly from the Carolinas; in September 1682 the *St. Christopher* took thirteen slaves from South Carolina to the island.<sup>73</sup> It is certainly possible that the Assembly of Barbados considered Carolina Indians—also captured through warfare—as undesirable as New England Indians had been a decade earlier. But even this 1688 act was designed merely to prohibit Indian slave importation, not to end Indian slavery in general on the island; well into the eighteenth century Barbados laws clearly reference “*Negro, Mulatto, or Indian Slaves*.”<sup>74</sup>

This June 1676 act, then, reveals the very specific concerns Barbadian planters had during King Philip’s War regarding the demonstrated conspiratorial and warlike abilities of New England Natives as well as the intimate connection between these concerns and the foiled May 1675 African revolt on Barbados. The planters desired to avoid—at all costs, including sending away already-arrived New England Indians—the possibility of another such attempted uprising. But in some ways the full text of this act raises as many questions as it answers, and it serves as a call to more fully explore Indian slavery in the colonial Caribbean, particularly relating to the movement of enslaved Indians around the Atlantic, the specific interconnections of Indian and African enslavement in various locales, and the degree to which enslaved Indian presences persisted well beyond and in spite of laws such as this one in 1676.

<sup>73</sup> For a discussion of the context of this 1688 law, see Handler, *New West Indian Guide/Nieuwe West-Indische Gids* 56: 21–22. Information on Carolina slaves brought to Barbados can be found in CO 5/1265, p. 29, NA, as cited by Gallay, *Indian Slave Trade*, 300. According to Gallay, Barbados “was the most likely destination for Indian slaves” sent out from South Carolina in the late seventeenth century due to “an extensive trade there in its first five decades.” *Ibid.*, 300.

<sup>74</sup> Regarding later Barbados laws indicating the ongoing presence of Indian slaves from unspecified origins, see for example a 1726 law that prevented “*Carrying off any Negro, Indian or Mulatto Slaves*.” Council of Trade and Plantations to the king, May 3, 1726, CO 29/14, pp. 420–21 (quotation, p. 420), NA.

*An Act of Explanation to the Act of Negroes,  
and to prohibite the bringing of Indians  
to this Island.*<sup>75</sup>

[421] Whereas as much harme and prejudice may happen to the Inhabitants of this Island by the Thefts and Villanyes of Indians as other Slaves. Be it therefore Enacted by his Excellency Sir Jonathan Atkins<sup>76</sup> Knight Captaine Generall and Cheife Governor of this and other the Caribbee Islands<sup>77</sup> the Councill & Assembly of this Island, And It is hereby Enacted and declared by the Authority aforesaid That all and every Acts of this Island restrayneing and punishing the Offences and Crimes of Negroes<sup>78</sup> were Intended to Comprehend and extend to All manner of Slaves remaineing in this Island, As well Indyans, Madagascars<sup>79</sup> as other Slaves. And It is hereby further declared and Enacted by the Authority aforesaid, that where any Slave or Slaves whatsoever Shall Attempt to Committ a Rape upon any Christian Woman or Girle in this Island, and upon such Attempt use any threats to effect his designe or put Such Woman or Girle in fear or dread of loosing hir life, every Slave or Slaves Soe offending Shall Suffer death in the Same Manner as if he or they had committed a rape, and to bee tryed and proceeded against as by the Said Acts of Negroes is appointed.

And forasmuch as that the Indians brought from New England, New Yorke, Roade Island and the Collonyes adjacent are knowne to be

<sup>75</sup> "An Act of Explanation to the Act of Negroes, and to prohibite the bringing of Indians to this Island," June 14, 1676, in "Transcript Acts," 421–23, Barbados Department of Archives. Page numbers in brackets in the text of the act indicate page numbers of the "Transcript Acts" volume. All superscript characters have been brought down to the line, paragraph indentation has been standardized, and the line breaks have been adjusted to fit this page (end-of-line hyphens have also been removed). The word *Barbados* is written in the margin next to the start of the title, and a symbol of a circle with a line through it follows "Island" at the end of the title.

<sup>76</sup> Jonathan Atkins served as governor of Barbados from 1674 to 1679.

<sup>77</sup> Like Lord Willoughby, who preceded him, Atkins served not only as governor of Barbados but also as the captain general and commander in chief of the Leeward Caribbean Islands. See Robert H. Schomburgk, *The History of Barbados; Comprising a Geographical and Statistical Description of the Island; A Sketch of the Historical Events since the Settlement; and an Account of its Geology and Natural Productions* (London, 1848), 294–95.

<sup>78</sup> The original 1661 slave law was titled "An Act for the better ordering and governing of Negroes," CO 30/2, pp. 16–26, NA. After the attempted rebellion in May 1675, the Assembly of Barbados passed a revised and expanded version of it in August 1675 and April 1676, as "A Supplementall Act to a former Act Entituled an Act for the Better Ordering and Governing of Negroes," CO 31/2, pp. 190, 221, NA.

<sup>79</sup> Although many Africans in Barbados were from Coromantee, some had also been imported from Madagascar and were often noted as such. In several places the Barbados entry books note Madagascar slaves separately from those from other regions in continental Africa. See for example Barbados Entry Book, 1675–80, CO 29/2, p. 2, NA.

Notorious Villanyes and by the bringing of Such Indians to this place is found they are such obstinate<sup>80</sup> Incorrigible Rogues and Cunning Thieves that from them greater mischief may happen to this Island then<sup>81</sup> from any Negroes, Be it therefore Enacted by the Authority aforesaid That from and after the date hereof noe Master or Commander of any Ship or Vessell whatsoever bringing any Such Indian or Indians into any Harbour or Creeke of this Island Shall bring any of such Indians on Shoare upon penalty of forfeiting Such Ship or Vessell with all hir Amunition Tackle Apparrell Guns &c.<sup>82</sup> The One halfe of Such forfeiture to be to the Informer against or Seizor of Such [422] Ship or Vessell, and the other halfe to the Publique use of this Island the same to be recovered by any Action or Information in any Court of Common Pleas in this Island, On which Action or Information the Defendant Shall appeare at the first Court after ten dayes Summons, and a tryall to be had and Judgment in the Same Manner as it is appointed by the Act of Excise of this Island. And if it be discerned that in any Ship or Vessell Indiyans as aforesaid are or shall be brought to this Island, That in Such case the Master or Commander of Such Ship or Vessell Shall have noe dispatch from the Secretaryes Office untill Such Master or Commander have a Certificate from the Commander of Needhams Fort<sup>83</sup> that all such Indians Soe brought to this Island are at that time on board the same Ship or Vessell in a readinesse to be carryed from this Island—And if afterwards it be made appeare by any wittnes or probable circumstance before *before*<sup>84</sup> the Governor in Cheife of this Island or any Cheife Judge that any Indian or Indians were left behind Such Ship or Vessell and not carryed off in her That after Such Oath is received and taken the Treasurer of this Island upon Notice of Such Oath Shall cause an Action to be brought in the behalfe of the Countrey upon the Bond in the Secretaryes Office,<sup>85</sup> which Bond for offending the Last branch of this Act is hereby declared and Enacted for the Penalty to be forfeited, And upon such Action Such proceedings to be as is before in this Act appointed to be for the forfeiture of any Ship or Vessell.—

<sup>80</sup> This word seems to be spelled “objtinate” in the original.

<sup>81</sup> Should be “than.”

<sup>82</sup> The manuscript includes an ambiguous symbol here; “&c.” makes the most contextual sense, as it appears at the end of a listing of items.

<sup>83</sup> Needham’s Fort was located on Carlisle Bay on the southwest coast of the island, just southeast of Bridgetown across the bay. Situated on a natural outcropping, it served as the first point of defense for the bay and Bridgetown and in the 1690s boasted forty-two guns. Governor Russell to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, Aug. 25, 1695, no. 2030, in *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, 14: 577.

<sup>84</sup> These duplicated and underlined (now italicized) words are a vestige of the seventeenth-century document, since it was the practice in colonial manuscripts to place the first word of the following page at the bottom of the previous page as a way of keeping pages in order and reducing scribal errors.

<sup>85</sup> There appears to be a superscripted “c” above the “c” in the word “Office” in the original document.

And for that Wee are fully Apprehensive of the great Evills the Indians allready in this Island from New England & places adjacent may bring upon this Place if they should continue here they being of a Subtle and dangerous Nature and able more cunningly to contrive and carry on those dangerous designes which our Negroes of the<sup>86</sup> Owne Nature are prone unto, Be it therefore Ordained and Enacted that Every Owner or possessor of any Such Indians doe within Six Moneths Next after Publication hereof Send away and export from this Island Such Indian or Indians to some other part or place, Soe as Wee may be freed from all Such Jealousyes and dangers to Apparent. And whosoever Shall Neglect or refuse to doe the Same Shall forfeite Ten thousand pounds of Musco Sugar<sup>87</sup> for every Such Indian that shall not be sent off within the tyme Limited as aforesaid the One halfe thereof to be to the Informer<sup>88</sup> the other halfe to the Publique use of this Island to be recovered by Action of Debt in any Court of Common Pleas in this Island in Manner as is in this Law before appointed..<sup>89</sup>

And Lastly It is Enacted by the Authority aforesaid that whatsoever person or persons at any time within the Space of Six Moneths before the date hereof hath purchased any Indian or Indians brought from New England or any<sup>90</sup> the places adjacent and hath not made Satisfaction for the Same, It shall be lawfull for the said person or persons soe Indebted to returne the [423] said Indian or Indians to the person of whome they were bought or to his Factor Agent or Attorney in this Island and Such returne or tender shall be sufficient Satisfaction for the Said Indians<sup>91</sup> or Indians against the Contract made or Bill or Writeing given for payment thereof.

Provided that such returne or tender be made within One Moneth next after Publication of this Act.

Read & passed<sup>92</sup> the Councell & Consented to by his Excellency this 14th of June 1676

Edwyn Stede Dep:ty Secr:ty

Read and passed the Assembly Nemine Contradicente<sup>93</sup> the 14th of June 1676

John Higinbotham Clerke of the Assembly

<sup>86</sup> Should be "their."

<sup>87</sup> Muscovado sugar. See III n. 39, as well as Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 195–96.

<sup>88</sup> There appears to be a superscripted "c" above the "m" in the word "Informer" in the original document.

<sup>89</sup> Duplicate periods appear here in the original document.

<sup>90</sup> Missing "of," as in "any of the places."

<sup>91</sup> Should be singular: "Indian."

<sup>92</sup> These two descriptions of when the act was read and passed appear side by side in the original document.

<sup>93</sup> "Nemine Contradicente": Latin, "with no one speaking against," signifying a unanimous vote.